## For the Northern District of California

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

| 1  |  |                                    |
|----|--|------------------------------------|
| 2  |  |                                    |
| 3  |  |                                    |
| 4  |  |                                    |
| 5  |  |                                    |
| 6  | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |                                    |
| 7  | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |                                    |
| 8  |  |                                    |
| 9  |  |                                    |
| 10 | ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,  | No. C 10-03561 WHA                 |
| 11 | Plaintiff,   |                                    |
| 12 | v.   |                                    |
| 13 | GOOGLE INC.,   | NOTICE RESERVING                   |
| 14 | Defendant.   | RULING ON WHETHER THE DISGORGEMENT |
| 15 |  | WILL GO TO THE JURY                |
| 16 | The issue of whether disgorgement is for the bench versus the jury has not been fully          |                                    |
| 17 | briefed and that issue is yet to be determined. Counsel, however, should presume that the ju   |                                    |
| 18 | will answer the disgorgement question in phase two and that at a minimum its verdict shall be  |                                    |
| 19 | tweeted as an advisery would at if not the only would at. The final nuctuial and an about dis- |                                    |

ry e treated as an advisory verdict, if not the only verdict. The final pretrial order should be understood accordingly.

Dated: April 29, 2016.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE